

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 26-53 were pending in the application, of which Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated February 6, 2006, Claims 26-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 26-53 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated February 6, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 26-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML integrated XML authoring and composition tool as disclosed by "Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML 5.5: Developing SGML Publishing Applications," 1997 (hereinafter "AFM97") and Charles F. Goldfarb and Paul Prescod, "The XML Handbooks," 1998 (hereinafter "Goldfarb and Prescod"), pp. 278-295, in view of Elliotte Rusty Harold, "XML Bible," 1999, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc. (art of record; hereinafter "Harold"). Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 26 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the

user wherein the resource data file includes tags not specified in a schema or a document type definition if the acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value.” Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 17, line 3 through page 18, line 14.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* at least do not teach or suggest a plurality of resource tag attribute default value mechanisms whose order corresponds to a precedence order of default values for the attributes. (See Office Action page 4, lines 15-17, and page 10, lines 6-9.) Accordingly, Applicants submit that because *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* do not suggest or disclose a precedence order of default values for the attributes, these references do not suggest or disclose the precedence order of default values comprising first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree. Consequently, *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* at least does not teach or suggest if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the user.

Furthermore, *Harold* does not overcome *AFM97*’s and *Goldfarb*’s deficiencies. *Harold* merely discloses, if there is not a rule that specifies a font size of an element, then the element inherits the font size of its parent. (See *Harold*, page 334, lines 5-6.) One way to avoid problems created by this inheritance while retaining some control over

the size of individual elements is to use relative units like "ems" and "ex's" instead of absolute units like points, picas, inches, centimeters, and millimeters. (See *Harold*, page 335, lines 5-7.) An "em" is the width of the letter *m* in the current font. (See *Harold*, page 335, lines 7-8.) An "ex" is the height of the letter *x* in the current font. (See *Harold*, page 335, 8-9.) If the font gets bigger, so does everything measured in "ems" and "ex's." (See *Harold*, page 335, line 9.) Furthermore, *Harold* discloses that a similar option for some properties is to use percentage units. (See *Harold*, page 335, line 9.)

Moreover, *Harold* discloses that if no value is inherited from a parent element, a default value is used. (See *Harold*, page 337, lines 13-14.) Like *AFM97* and *Goldfarb*, *Harold* at least does not teach or suggest first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree, if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, and then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree. Furthermore, *Harold* at least does not teach or suggest if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the user. Rather, *Harold* merely discloses using relative units instead of absolute units or using percentage units and if there is no value is inherited from a parent element, a default value is used.

Combining *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold* would not have led to the claimed invention because *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the

tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the user wherein the resource data file includes tags not specified in a schema or a document type definition if the acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value", as recited by amended Claim 26. Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43.

Dependent Claims 27-33, 35-37, 39-41, and 44-53 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 27-33, 35-37, 39-41, and 44-53.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Dated: May 2, 2006

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:mdc